DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 999 EA 015 156

AUTHOR Jennings, Robert E.
TITLE Systems Politics as an Arbiter of Planned Change: The Case of the Deputy in English Local Education Authorities.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (New York, NY, March 18-21, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; Centralization; Decision Making; Educational Change; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; Institutional Autonomy; *Local Government; *Organizational Change; *Power Structure; School Districts; Social Action; Superintendents; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *England; *System Politics

ABSTRACT

The organization of local government in England underwent significant structural revision during the 1970s, creating centralized authorities focused on objectives and service delivery systems rather than on organizational structures and the separate services delivered. As the most autonomous local agency prior to reorganization, education was the most threatened by this shift in authority and organizational concerns, finding itself in a situation identified by the author of this report as offering a good opportunity for observing system politics at work. One of four types of politics associated with policy-making, system politics comprises the struggles over structures and procedures to be used for deciding policy. The study reported in this paper turned on how the new government-school relationship affected the role of the deputy director of education. Interviews with governmental and educational administrators and extensive consultation of documentary sources provided the data. The study identified significant changes in the deputy director's role, including a movement away from organizational duties and toward more functional duties, a broadening of responsibilities beyond educational and professional functions to more managerial functions, and a shift from ad hoc tasks to more regular activities in the education department's external relationships. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222999

SYSTEMS POLITICS AS AN ARBITER OF PLANNED CHANGE:

The Case of the Deputy in English Local Education Authorities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert E. Jennings
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Robert E. Jennings

Department of Educational Administration
State University of New York at Buffalo

A paper prepared for the
1982 Comparative and International Education Society
Annual Meeting, March 18-21, New York City

EA 015 156

Introduction

This paper is about reorganization and change in local government. It is not about the reform of education but, rather, it explores reform in government and the implications of this for the administration of education. In that sense, it is a study in system politics, the struggle over the question of which structures and procedures shall be used for decision-making. Moreover, it deals with the question of professional participation in decision-making vs. political/managerial control of the decision system.

System Politics

The problems of system politics have not been of great importance to those of us in policy analysis. Since the early sixties, most study of policy-making has been process oriented and heavily influenced by behavioural approaches. The emphasis has been on the actors in the process, what they did, when and why. This is clear from the models that have been constructed and which are used as the conceptual frameworks for many studies.[1] Formal structures and procedures have become secondary to personalities and participation. If anything, structures and procedures are perceived as constraints with which the policy-maker must cope: too little is made of how these are used to formulate and administer policy.

Four types of politics can be identified which bear on policy making and the implementation of policy. These are, borrowing from Wildavsky: policy politics concerned with the question of which policy will be adopted; partisan politics concerned with which party will win a contest over policy alternatives as in a legislature or over policy preferences in how to govern as in an election; system politics which deals with the

contest over what structures and procedures will be instituted and used in producing policy decisions; and patronage politics which is about who gets what tasks or jobs in the policy-making system.[2] In the paper in which he sketched these ideas, Wildavsky was pointing out that the installation of technological systems of cost-benefit analysis such as PPBS could bend the political system away from its true purposes, the sorting out of values and goals. This, he noted, was the province of elected politicians, not managerial or efficiency experts. Clearly, who won in any conflict over structures and procedures to be adopted for making policy would have a great deal of control over policy and its administration.

Similar concerns for control of the system are occasionally evident in education, not in terms of efficiency but in terms of effectiveness. Bailey's study of the U.S. Office of Education, as it set about to administer the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, revealed that the objectives of the Act would be most difficult to attain if the old line specialist in education structure of U.S.O.E. were left in place. More than a simple reorganization was required because new processes and procedures had to recognize that education was now an instrument of social policy, reaching out to the disadvantaged. Education was no longer to be dealt with in parts by specializations but as a totality which integrated skills and social concerns. Control of the structures and procedures to bring this about was shifted from educationists to administrators at O.E.[3]

The changes in English local government were far more sweeping but had a similar purpose in that they were based in the recognition of changed social conditions. The nation had become urbanized but the pattern

of government had been developed to serve rural populations. The services of government were delivered quite efficiently but not always effectively. There was little understanding of a total community with a range of needs or of government as a total delivery system operating on defined priorities. The following section outlines the reorganization of local government in England. Its purposes were to reform but, as will be pointed out, there were unanticipated consequences which left the effort somewhat short of the mark and set the stage for the conflict over the control of the decision-making machinery.

Reorganization and Reform

Reorganization had two purposes: to balance the populations and wealth of jurisdictions and to consolidate services at the level of government where they were most effective. This would set the stage for the modernization of local government administration. The local Government Act of 1972, implemented in 1974, created two tiers or levels of government: 36 metropolitan districts within 6 metropolitan counties and 39 non-metropolitan counties with 333 rural districts. The "soft" areas of governmental responsibility, people-oriented services, were split. Housing was placed at a district level within counties while planning remained at the county level. Health services were moved to a regional system by passage of the Health Services Reorganization Act. Education was consolidated at the metropolitan district level and the non-metropolitan county level as was social services. The number of local education authorities in England was reduced from 145 to 96 (36 metropolitan districts, 39 counties, 20 outer London boroughs and the Inner London Education Authority, ILEA). Extremes of population size and taxable wealth had been reduced

while creating larger, more self-contained authorities. This was to the benefit of education and its administration because it rationalized the service within given jurisdictions.

The need to modernize governmental structures at the local level had been observable since the 1950's.[4] The local council, made up of elected members by wards was the policy-making body of the authority with the committee system of the council as the heart of the structure. It reflected the historical accretion of local government functions; a new service meant a new committee and a committee implied the need for another department and chief officer. It also reflected the separation of services one from the other and the competition between services for funding and control of activities. Executive responsibility was ultimately with the council but, as a body, it did not have an executive officer to direct activities. At reorganization, the council and its committee system remained a polycentric structure for policy-making, each major service having its committee to deliberate and propose policies for council adoption within that sphere. The main task in modernization, then, was to find ways of breaking down the compartmentalization, to provide the means of coordinating the policy and management subsystems which, in effect, the several committees and related departments formed.

The Committee on the Management of Local Government (Maud Committee), reporting in 1967, had recommended structural changes. The key concept was the establishment of a management board consisting of five to nine council leaders to formulate authority-wide objectives, coordinate the committees and to review progress toward stated objectives. There was to be a chief executive officer (CE) to supervise the effectiveness of the officers and departments in achieving authority objectives through

what became known as a corporate management approach.[5] These recommendations referred to local government as it existed prior to the 1972 Act.

As reorganization came closer, the Study Group on Local Authority Management Structures (Bains Committee) was set up. The Committee endorsed the structural changes proposed by Maud and recommended process changes using these structures. The management board concept in Bains' language became the policy and resources committee of the local council. Policy development was to remain with the service committees where members and officers would interact in a corporate structure. Policy and resources was to be the coordinative body providing another setting through which members (and officers on invitation) interacted. Additionally, Bains urged that the CE become first among equals in a management team or advisory group of chief officers from all of the services. The functions of the team were to be the provision of advice on policy implementation and the review of managerial effectiveness in departments.[6]

The two concepts on which the improvement of local government effectiveness were to rest were corporate planning and corporate management. Both are ways of looking at processes in the setting of objectives and the implementation of policy. They were adapted from academics' view of business corporations and developed by academics for application to government. The Maud Committee report suggested their application in 1967 and the Bains' Committee gave them impetus in its 1972 report.

Essentially, corporate planning and corporate management mean that the authority defines its objectives as an entity, plans policies to achieve them and, through the combined activities of its service departments, carries out the policies using available resources. Viewed as a problem-solving scheme, the emphasis is on objectives rather than structures, on

processes rather than hierarchies and on systems of service delivery rather than separate services. In operation, the council's policy and resources committee in the new structures would oversee the setting of objectives. Policy-making could then be delegated to the service committees or subcommittees of policy and resources. The administration of policy would rest with the service committees and the officers. To aid in the coordination of administration, the council would establish a board of chief officers under the chief executive, the officers' management team. This team would also be used to review department plans and to review the management techniques of departments.[7]

There were many unresolved problems in going corporate. The reforms as instituted in local authorities appeared to strike particularly hard at the education service, reducing its traditional autonomy within local government and its high degree of control over its decision processes.[8] The original study behind this paper was undertaken to examine those problems. The study and its conclusions are summarized in the next section.

The Study and Its Implications

The 1978-79 study focused on corporate planning/corporate management and its impact on educational policy-making in four local authorities.* The elected councils in all four authorities were party political controlled. Each authority had instituted the main structural elements of corporateness, the policy and resources committee, the office of chief executive and officers' management team. One county and one city had done so just prior

---

*The preliminary results of this study, supported by the Leverhulme Trust Fund, are reported in Robert E. Jennings, Corporateness and Education: Changing power relationships in local government, Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No. 11, Sheffield: The Polytechnic, 1980.

to the 1974 reorganization and the other city and county made the change at reorganization. The data was gathered through in-depth interviews with sixty-five key participants: the chief executive, chief officers or directors and council leaders in each authority. Extensive use was made of documents including officers' briefing papers, council committee reports, corporate planning outlines and position papers as well as political party manifestos and newspaper articles. Other observations were made at meetings and through visits with staff members in various departments. The findings were reported under two main headings, policy planning and management structures and processes.

The conclusions focused on the system at the top: the majority party leadership, the chief executive, the director of education and the officers' management team. The outcomes were explained in terms of system politics. Three main factors were identified which accounted for many of the difficulties that the education service was experiencing in facing the new decision-making system. In short, the study showed why things weren't working from the perspective of the education service. What may be more critical were the implications which arose out of the conclusions. Three statements are made below, followed by the implications.

First, what was observed in the four authorities studied was a centralization of decision-making in local government. It appeared that centralization came about because it favors party political control and aids and abets the chief executive in the power struggles to establish this new post. The education service suffered because centralization had broken in on the closed politics of education as previously operated in local authorities. Centralization became a new, closed, political-administrative system at another place in the new corporate hierarchy.

Attempting to use the older ways of educational policy-making became dysfunctional for the service because access to the new system has been severely limited. The analysis did not reveal in any depth how directors of education were moving to counter centralization or to reassert the claims of education through the redevelopment of access. What was observed in the time span of the study was a continuing defensive posture on the part of the education professionals, actions designed largely to hold on to what the service had.

Second, it was concluded that the chief executive had become potentially the single most powerful appointed officer in local government. This came about, not through formal assigned authority, but more by political arrangement with the controlling party leadership. Where such arrangements had been concluded, as they had in three of the four authorities studies, they were further buttressed by a high degree of control over the flow and interpretation of information as well as a firm hold on the personnel function, often with the aid of other central services officers such as the treasurer and personnel director. Once these basic controls are in place, the CE had vast power concentrated in his office which could be weilded day to day without reference to the leadership.

At the officer level, the rise of the chief executive to a position of "first among equals" was characterized as a premier example of systems politics. Originally conceived as a post without a department, the office of the executive quickly burgeoned to take in two critical functional elements, information and personnel. The first meant control of intelligence-gathering and processing as well as interposing on the communications lines for such vital processes as policy planning and budget-making. The second meant taking charge of or participating the assessment of needs,

hiring and assignment of personnel for all departments. In so far as the chief executive can control information and personnel, he has the power to compel directors to deal with him within the management structure, especially the officers' management team.

Third, the main complaint which directors had against the command and control powers of the CE has been that they have been used to make decisions rather than to manage the decision process through the officers' management team. The question was not specifically tested in the study but it is observable that when chief officers are defensive and set about buying time through consensus decisions, the CE just might make a final determination based on his assessments of the majority party's political aims or on his perceptions of what a sound management choice would be.

The conclusion which flows from such a statement is that a managerially desirable end, say, the reduction of costs, will override an evident professionally determined need, say, the broadening of school curriculum. The director's view is that the elected members should thrash out the question of priorities, with advice from both the professional educator and the professional manager. When the CE makes the decision, there is the suspicion that it may be more in line with maintaining his place and power with the majority or retaining his hold on the decision process with some assessment of what is needed in the community.

There were many implications for the future development of local services, given the new concentration of political and managerial power in local authorities. Education could be the most affected as it had been the largest, most autonomous of all the services. Additionally, having developed a high degree of dependence on a now defunct system of

closed politics, it becomes more vulnerable because the ability to protect its "sacred cow" posture has been removed.

For the education service and directors of education, the question becomes one of determining what parts of the new decision system are most useful and which might be irrelevant in maintaining education's place and influence within local government. Should education try to use the machinery of corporate management to outmaneuver the manager or strike out for a new political arrangement? Should education seek to establish its own research and intelligence unit? If so, should it be integrated with any central unit? Should the department personnel section (for teaching staff only) be fully coordinated with the personnel officer's operations or should it make cases for differential treatment? Could the chief officers' management team be used to review and promote education and its plans or should it be ignored? Above all, what forums should be used to interact with the chief executive and other central services officers? There are high risks in choosing the strategies because the system as it now exists is not as predictable as directors of education would like it to be.

Having raised these questions, it seemed desirable to look for some answers. After all, decisions were still being made and implemented and, perhaps the education service was exerting influence on them through other points of access. In short, having found out what wasn't working well in the new system, it seemed useful to try to find out what was keeping it ticking over, from the perspective of the education service. Out of that re-examination, the changed role of the deputy director of education began to emerge.

The Evolving Role of The Deputy Director of Education

A question about the role of the deputy director of education arose in the 1978-79 study when it appeared that the deputy didn't have much to do, compared with pre-reorganization days. It had been assumed that the deputy role would continue to be organizationally defined and internal to the education department while the director bore the brunt of the external political struggle for a place of influence in the new decision system. If there were major changes in what deputies did, these would come out in document search. However, what began to appear in interview data, collected from officers outside of education, was that the deputies' role was evolving around new functions and on-going, regularized inter-departmental relationships. The deputy was doing a great deal of work which wasn't always reflected in the job descriptions or lists of duties and responsibilities in the education department. What adds to the drama is the fact that there had been strong suggestions from the national committees on reorganization and reform to eliminate the post of deputy in all services.

The next question after the discovery of possible new dimensions to the deputy's role were, why was this happening? What was the role becoming and might the changes which were taking place be explained through the concept of system politics? In turn, could these findings help explain the larger results of the study? The next several pages explore the changing role of the deputy director of education by looking back a decade and tracing what was observed into what was discovered in the 1978-79 study.

The post of deputy director of education is one which the director can use to delegate a number of duties and functions or none at all. About

the only set task is to deputize for the director when he is out of the authority. But the deputy has a great deal of experience in educational administration on which the director can draw in assigning responsibilities to the number two officer in the department. In a career of eight to ten years, the deputy has probably served in two or more authorities, and has most likely worked in several divisions as a fourth tier officer and headed at least one division as an assistant officer.[9] The capstone of that career comes with advancement to director. Indeed, in the late 1950's and early 1960's four/fifths of all directors of education had been the "sitting" deputy in the authority where they became the director.

There were several conventional ways in which directors and deputies divided department responsibilities. The two main ones were organizational, dividing up the divisions or units of the department, or functional, each taking up activities and tasks which cut across several divisions and units. Often, the two were mixed with each officer responsible for a division and several functions. To illustrate:

Organizational
Director: Schools, Further Education
Deputy: Careers, Youth Service, Buildings

Functional
Director: Development and Finance
Deputy: Advisory Services, Curriculum Development, Staffing, Catering

Mixed
Director: Schools, Development
Deputy: Further Education, Curriculum, Staffing

The director made these decisions based on the structure of the department, his own interests and expertness as well as some assessment of the political saliency of issues likely to arise. On the later point, going comprehensive was an issue which the director invariably handled in the 1960's, regardless of regular arrangements of responsibility. Another factor for consideration

was the external relationships, dealing with other officers: who might get on best with the treasurer, the town clerk or the director of works in the conduct of department business?

In the charts which follow, the duties of deputy directors of education are reported. They illustrate a decade of change in the role through the period of reorganization and reform in local government. In each chart the effects of various recommendations will be pointed out, as well as effects from developments in education. However, there are limitations on the data which should be borne in mind. It has all been put together, post hoc, using interview results and documents from a variety of authorities in three different studies. Also, for convenience, the conventional duties of deputizing and special assignments from the director have been omitted as catagories. Special assignments might include everything from preparation of the directorate meeting agendas through to leading a working party on ROSLA and from the clerking of committees on to drafting a brief on the impact of the latest DES circular.

Chart 1, based on a 1969 survey of the larger Outer London Boroughs, shows that deputies usually had at least one division to run and a functional task which reached across several divisions. If he had line responsibility for two divisions, there was usually an assistant officer for each reporting to him. In two authorities where the deputy was in charge of the building program, the importance of secondary education going comprehensive was reflected in a specification to his duties. The functional duties of coordinating advisors and curriculum development, seen in six authorities, reflects the shift from quasi-independent local inspectorates to school level and subject matter advisors as well as the addition of Mode III courses. These

Chart 1. Duties of Deputy Chief Education Officers, in Twelve Outer London Boroughs, 1969-70[1]

Authority	Finance and establishment	Buildings, projections and plans, development schemes	Cross-divisional matters, e.g., staffing, school meals, grounds	Coordination of advisors, curriculum development	Liaison with teacher organization	Representation at social and ceremonial events	Representation on a regional development board
OLB 1	X	X *					
OLB 2							X
OLB 3				X			
OLB 4	X		X				
OLB 5		X *					
OLB 6		X					
OLB 7	X			X		X	
OLB 8	X*			X			
OLB 9				X			
OLB 10	X						
OLB 11	X*			X	X		
OLB 12	X*	X		X			

*Finance handled by the Administrative Officers, supervised by the Deputy.

**Mainly responsible for ensuring that schemes aid and abet secondary reorganization.

[1]Survey conducted by Society of Education Officers (London Region), 1969, unpublished.

were the results of educational changes fostered by the Schools Council and Nuffield studies of school offerings. Several authorities were also developing sixth form colleges as a part of secondary reorganization.

The duties in finance, establishment (personel) and buildings meant that these deputies were representing the department with the treasurer, town clerk and the director of works. This was largely a coordinating role at this time as the departments did most of their own planning, hiring and monitoring of expenditures. In OLB 11, there was a centralization of the personnel function in the office of the town clerk, cum chief executive, and the deputy had direct responsibility only in the matter of teaching staff.

The source of Chart 1 is interesting in itself. As national committees on local government administration began to report, there was a threat that the post of deputy in all local services might be abolished. The Maud Committee recommended in 1967 that every principal officer have responsibility for a division or unit and that all officers, as a team, were responsible for the functional tasks of department management and coordination.[10] The objective was reduction of the span of control and greater efficiency. The Bains Committee, in 1972, noted that a number of authorities had eliminated deputy posts and recommended that the question be given hard scrutiny in every new authority. In short, the Committee did not see a need for a deputy to every director.[11] The chart data and an accompanying brief were prepared as evidence for the Bains Committee by the Society of Education Officers. The brief attempted to head off abolition of the deputy's post by noting that corporate schemes, aimed at authority-wide planning and management coordination, would increasingly take the director away from

the day to day affairs of the department. Thus the deputy would become the one main contact for members and officers and would also have greater responsibility for the overall supervision of the service.

The influence of these debates is evident in Chart 2, which uses data from a 1973-74 study of educational policy-making. Every deputy in the six authorities was in charge of two or more divisions. In County A, the three deputies were in charge of the three main divisions. In OLB 4, the deputy has added buildings and development to his finance division responsibility. In OLB 11, the director and the deputy had split the department down the middle with further education, careers and youth services being added to the duties of the deputy. The new terms appear under functional duties, coordination of department management and research and evaluation. In County A, deputy 1 was linked to the chief executive's research unit more or less as its "education branch." In OLB 11, however, this function was internal to the department and results were shared with the chief executive at the discretion of the director.

When reorganization became fact in 1974, a number of deputies were shaken out of local government either through individuals taking advantage of special retirement options or by the abolition of posts. Deputies in education fared better than some, contrary to earlier fears. According to two past presidents of the Society of Education Officers (1974 and 1979), some five or six deputies rose to director in the new authorities while between eight and twelve took retirement. A few metropolitan districts and non-metropolitan counties abolished deputy posts (one of these is included in Chart 3). Others did away with selected posts in smaller departments but the size and complexity of education was a useful rationale for retaining the deputy in most places.[12]

Chart 2. Duties of Deputy Directors of Education in Three Shire Counties and Three Outer London Boroughs, 1973-74[1]

	Organizational					Functional			
Authority	Finance and Establishment	Buildings, projections and plans, development schemes	Schools Division	FE Division	FE, Careers, Youth Service Divisions	Coordination of department management	Research and Evaluation	Coordination of advisors	Liaison with teachers organizations
County A1	X	X					X		
A2			X						
A3				X					
County B		X							
County C				X					
OLB 4	X	X				X			
OLB 5		X**							X
OLB 11	X*				X		X	X	X

*Finance handled by the Administrative Officer, supervised by the Deputy.

**Mainly responsible for seeing that plans aid and abet secondary school reorganization.

[1]From a study of educational policy making, general findings published in R. E. Jennings, Education and Politics: Policy Making in Local Education Authorities, London: B. T. Batsford, 1977.

Chart 3 is based on data from the 1978-79 study. It was the observable sparcity of specified duties which raised the original question. In the two counties, neither deputy has any line responsibility, only functional duties. These focus on information: research and evaluation, enrollment and resources. Both are internal to the department but, as can be seen in Chart 4, most useful in the interface with the planning and budget-making processes of the authority. In County D, the personnel responsibility was carried out in very close coordination with a central services officer, the deputy county secretary. Districts Y and Z retained the deputy as head of single divisions. It should be noted, however, that in Y the title is administrative officer but the role is de facto a deputy role.[13] In District Z, management and planning coordination was constituted as a unit of the department, reflecting a rising emphasis on this kind of work. (The unit was never fully staffed or operational from its inception in 1976.)

The last row in Chart 4 summarizes the discoveries made about what deputies do. Moreover, these functional activities, labeled cooperative, provide evidence about the changing nature of the decision system. A brief look at the developments in each authority follows.

In County D, the deputy county secretary brought deputies of several departments together to create a semi-centralized personnel system after the officers' management team rejected the idea of a personnel department. When the national Health and Safety at Work Act had to be implemented, the OMT called on the deputies group to do it. These two tasks resulted in the formalization of the deputies team which now has the duties listed and takes other items on remit from the OMT.

Chart 3. Duties of Deputy Directors of Education in Two Metropolitan Districts and Two Non-metropolitan Counties, 1978-79[1]

	Organizational		Functional						
Authority	Finance, buildings, staff training, catering	Management planning and coordination	Non-teaching staff	Press and publicity	Research and evaluation	Personnel	Curriculum development, evaluation, advisors	Enrollments and resources	Maintenance and repair of facilities and equipment
County D					X	X			
County E							X	X	
District Y*	X								X
District Z**		X	X	X					

*There are no deputy posts in this authority. The Administrative Officers in Education and several other departments deputize for their Directors.

**The Deputy in this authority resigned in 1978 and was no replaced until late 1979. Duties reported here are from 1977 documents.

[1]From data gathered for, R. E. Jennings, Corporateness and Education: Changing Power Relationships in Local Government, Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No. 11, Sheffield: The Polytechnic, 1980.

Chart 4. Duties of Deputy Directors of Education in Two Metropolitan Districts and Two Non-metropolitan Counties, 1979-79, with Detail of Functional Duties

Duties	Authority: County D	County E	District Y	District Z
Organizational			Finance, buildings, staff training and catering	Management planning and coordination
Functional (Department)	Research and evaluation; personnel*	Curriculum development and resources	Maintenance and repair of facilities and equipment*	Non-teaching staff; press and publicity
Functional (Special)		Fuel emergency		Committee relationships, Roman Catholic School Reorganization; Area redevelopment*
Functional+ (Cooperative)	Personnel system,* capital projects, coordination, health and safety, management reviews, fuel efficiency, other items on remit from Officers Management Team	Facilities and equipment needs, fuel efficiency, other items on remit from Officers Management Team	Management reviews, finance advisory, transportation, items on remit from General Purposes Sub-committee of P & R	Local government reorganization,++ capital projects++

*Carried out in coordination with a central services officer.

+Carried out as representative of the department on a deputies' group or team.

++Carried out as department representative in chief executive's projects unit.

In County E, the deputies met with the assistant chief executive. The group began by looking into building and equipment needs of the authority and making recommendations to the chief executive. It has continued as a development committee with items of resources and planning projections which are sent to OMT as part of the budget-making process.

In District Y, the administrative officers of the several departments act as an advisory committee to the treasurer. They undertake management reviews and oversee authority transport needs, working to the management services director. The general purposes subcommittee of policy and resources sends questions of finance and facilities to the administrative officers group through the treasurer.

In District Z, the chief executive's capital projects unit, charged with keeping building construction on time and on budget, is the only continuing deputies group. The local government reorganization group of the CE was more ad hoc, involving directors on some questions, deputies on others. Area redevelopment began with one project involving the deputies of several services. Neither of the last two groups appeared to be active at the time of the study.

Reviewing the information and accepting the limitations of the data, three trends are observable in the evolving role of the deputy director of education.

1. There is a movement away from organizational duties, line administration, toward more functional duties and tasks reaching across the several divisions and units of the education department.

2. There is a broadening of responsibilities beyond education and professional unique functions, e.g., curriculum development, to include

more generic managerial activities, e.g., personnel, management planning and coordination, resource development and use.

3. There is a shift from ad hoc tasks in the external relationships of the department, e.g., consultation on facilities and finance, to more regularized authority-wide activities, e.g., resource needs and uses, managerial efficiency, personnel processes, in well defined, continuing groups or teams.

Under the third trend, it should be noted that the remit of the team often originates with a central services officer or the officers' management team rather than from departments. The significance of these trends are discussed below.

Discussion

In answer to the questions posed earlier in terms of system politics, the struggle over the structures and procedures to be used in decision-making, it seems clear that the evolving role of the deputy in education has been a part of it. The conclusions of the main study pointed up the fact that the director of education was heavily involved in the political tasks of maintaining the place and influence of the education service in the new system. He was working out how to face a more centralized decision system, attempting to make it more predictable and, at the same time, defending the service from unwarranted encroachment by the chief executive and others, especially in those areas where professional judgement was required. But, regardless of those outcomes, education could not be left out or just choose to take part in those issues where it felt a vital concern. Whatever happened in the way of decisions, education had to be represented in and be a part of implementation.

This recognized a need for someone in the department to take on a series of tasks which would keep the department connected with the on-going routines of the authority and who could express its views in working out the details after policy had been decided or when principles had been agreed. The deputy director was the obvious choice. By and large freed of day to day divisional responsibilities, with broad experience in several aspects of the service as well as knowledge in finance, personnel management, the deputy could step into these tasks easily. Beyond that, he was professionally close to the director and could share his chief's assessments of the managerial politics involved in any issue.

Directors of services may have initiated the new external dimensions of the deputy role in several cases but some examples indicate that instigation came from central services officers or through the officers' management team. Some matters seem to have come to the deputies because the OMT couldn't reach a consensus. However, continued participation by a deputy had to have the acquiescence of his director. The further assumption has to be made that such participation was successful from the point of view of the education department because the tasks of the deputies' teams appear to have burgeoned.

In sum, it appears that the evolving role of the deputy director of education became useful in maintaining the place of education in the new corporate systems of local authorities. It also appears that the process of going corporate contributed to the evolving role of the deputy. His partipipation in the decision process in another forum or at another level gave the education service another opportunity to exert some influence on the system. If the service didn't achieve its purposes in the officers' management team or through the initial discussions of policy alternatives, for

example, there was another opportunity to shape the decisions as they were being executed or implemented.

References

[1]cf., Thomas Dye, Understanding Public Policy, 3rd edition, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

[2]Aaron Wildavsky, "The Political Economy of Efficiency," Public Administration Review, Vol. 26, 1966, pp. 292-310.

[3]Stephen K. Bailey, The Office of Education and the Education Act of 1965, New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966.

[4]H. Maddick and E. P. Pritchard, "The Conventions of Local Authorities in the West Midlands," Part I, Public Administration, Summer, 1958, pp. 145-55; W. A. Robson, Local Government in Crisis, 2nd edition, London: Geo. Allen and Unwin, 1968.

[5]The Committee on the Management of Local Government, "Report of the Committee," Vol. 1 of The Management of Local Government, London: HMSO, 1967, pp. 43-7.

[6]The Study Group on Local Authority Management Structures, The New Local Authorities: Management and Structure, London: HMSO, 1972.

[7]J. D. Stewart, The Responsive Local Government, Tonbridge: Chas. Knight, 1974, pp. 15-18.

[8]See D. Fiske, "Education: The Cuckoo in the Local Government Nest," Lady Simon of Wythenshawe Memorial Lectures, Manchester, 1975, 18 p.; G.M.A. Harrison, Forum, Vol. 19, No. 1, Autumn 1976, pp. 12-14; S. Ranson, "Notes on a Converence: Education and Corporate Management," Local Government Studies, Vol. 4, No. 2, April 1978.

[9]D. Birley, The Education Officer and His World, London: RKP, 1970; Robert E. Jennings, Education and Politics, London: B. T. Batsford, 1977, pp. 117-118.

[10]Maud, op. cit., p. 35.

[11]Bains, op. cit., p. 55.

[12]R. Greenwood, et al., In Pursuit of Corporate Rationality, Birmingham: INLOGOV, ca. 1976, p. 243.